

**Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

09/712,780

Applicant(s)

SHETH ET AL.

Examiner

David Lazaro

Art Unit

2155

**All Participants:**(1) David Lazaro.(2) Marc Hanish (42,626).**Status of Application:** Allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 30 June 2004**Time:** 1:00 PM**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

*All independent claims (1, 8, 15, 22 and 30)*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The claims as presented in the amendment filed 05/06/2004 potentially had an issue with the written description requirement. The general issue was if the Applicants intended to claim either exclusive access to only one particular service on a device on a particular domain or exclusive access to only that particular domain with the ability to use the services the domain provided. Since the latter was true, an agreement was made to change, through examiner's amendment, the claim language of "to access only said service on said network device" (from Claim 1) such that the language reflects exclusive access to only a particular domain. Such an amendment would make the claims allowable. Also, in regards to an IDS that was requested by the Applicants to be considered, the IDS of concern is missing from the case file and the Applicants were advised to file the original IDS along with the return receipt.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY